



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD: A STUDY OF LOCAL LIFE IN THE CITY OF COLUMBUS, OHIO

R. D. McKENZIE
University of Washington

ABSTRACT

Meaning of the concept neighborhood. It is difficult to define the neighborhood in the modern city. Interpretations of neighborhood made by various scholars seem to include three elements: spatial proximity to some focus of attention; physical or cultural differentiation from surrounding areas; intimacy of association among the inhabitants of the area. *History of the neighborhood.* Primitive peoples for the most part live in small territorial societies. The village community type of social organization represents the dominance of neighborhood over kinship as a bond of union. The ancient city was frequently but a federation of small locality groups. Even the modern city grows, as a rule, by the inclusion of small suburban communities, many of which retain their local self-consciousness for years after incorporation. *Elements of neighborhood association.* Cooley refers to the neighborhood as the universal nursery of the primary human ideals, such as kindness, loyalty, self-sacrifice, etc.; however hostility as well as mutual aid may flourish in neighborhood association. *Common sense conception of city neighborhood.* Students in Columbus defined neighborhood as the small personal area immediately surrounding their homes. *Organized neighborhoods in Columbus.* Several different streets of the city have developed local organizations for the promotion of local interests, such as street beautification, protection from industrial encroachments, and the encouragement of sociability. A study of these organizations shows that they are largely the products of the initiative and industry of a few individuals or families on each street.

III. THE NEIGHBORHOOD

The general effect of the continuous sifting and sorting of a city's population, as we have seen in the foregoing chapters, is to produce a patchwork of local areas differentiated from one another by cultural, racial, or linguistic peculiarities. In common parlance such areas are usually designated as localities, districts, colonies, or neighborhoods. Since the neighborhood is one of our oldest social institutions and since it is again coming into the focus of attention of writers on urban questions,¹ let us briefly examine its applicability to local life in the city environment.

Probably no other term is used so loosely or with such changing content as the term neighborhood, and very few concepts are more

¹ See, e.g., such recent books as M. P. Follett's *The New State* (1918), and John Daniel's *America via the Neighborhood* (1920).

difficult to define. The word neighborhood has two general connotations: physical proximity to a given object of attention, and intimacy of association among people living in close proximity to one another. On the flat plains of the agricultural states there are no objective marks by means of which the stranger can distinguish one rural neighborhood from another, yet almost any individual approached can give a very definite answer as to what constitutes his neighborhood; it simply embraces the area round about his home in which reside those families with whom he has intimate and direct personal relations.

In the city, on the other hand, there are very distinct objective differences between the various residential areas, but little or no personal acquaintance or group association among the families of any particular area. It is on account of these peculiarities of city life that we find so many different usages of the term neighborhood. Some writers are accustomed to use the word as implying mere physical proximity to a certain institution or topographical feature.¹ Others refer to the neighborhood as a cultural area,² sufficiently differentiated from the surrounding territory to be considered as a unit, while others again use the word in its traditional sense as implying intimacy of association³ and personal acquaintance.

¹ Stuckenberg, *Sociology*, I (1903), 81.

² Park defines the neighborhood, "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the City Environment" (*American Journal of Sociology*, XX, 579), as "a locality with sentiments, traditions, and a history of its own."

³ Cooley lists the neighborhood as an example of a "primary group" (see *Social Organization*, chap. iii) and he defines a "primary group" elsewhere (*Amer. Jour. of Sociol.*, XXV, 327) as, "an intimate group, the intimacy covering a considerable period and resulting in a habitual sympathy, the mind of each being filled with a sense of the mind of the others, so that the group as a whole is the chief sphere of the social self for each individual in it of emulation, ambition, resentment, loyalty, etc." Kellogg in a rather vague way says, "the neighborhood is an intermediate group between the family and the city, among those communal organizations in which people live as distinct from purposeful organisations in which they work (*Charities and Correction* [1909], p. 176). Taylor (*Religion in Social Action*, p. 166) states that "the neighborhood is to be regarded as an extension of the home and the church, and is identified closely with both." Wood refers to the neighborhood (*Amer. Jour. of Sociol.*, XIX, 580), as "the most satisfactory and illuminating form of the social extension of personality, of the interlacing and comprehensive complex of the interplay of personalities; the social unit which can by its clear definition of outline, its inner organic completeness, its hair-trigger reactions, be fairly considered as functioning

The concept neighborhood has come down to us from a distant past and therefore has connotations which scarcely fit the facts when applied to a patch of life in a modern large city. As far back as we have record human society seems to have been composed of a vast number of small intimate groups more or less definitely attached to fixed localities.

W. G. Sumner says (*Folkways*, p. 12), "The concept of 'primitive society' which we ought to form is that of small groups scattered over a territory." Most of the native peoples of the present day live in small neighborhood groups knit together by notions of kinship, common custom, and local feeling. The Dyaks of Borneo live in small villages, "each of which is inhabited by a dozen families and sometimes by several hundred persons, peacefully living together" (P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid* [1907], p. 110). "The Arunta of Central Australia are distributed in a large number of small local groups, each of which occupies a given area of country and has its own headman . . . and the members of each group are bound together by a strong 'local feeling'" (Edward Westermarck, *Moral Ideas*, Vol. II [1908], 199). L. T. Hobhouse relates that "the Yahgans . . . live in small groups of three or four families, without any regular clan organization, though with fairly well established customs to which the feeling of the community lends support, a support which is frequently vindicated by force of arms. . . . The Veddahs consist of a mere handful of scattered families living sometimes in trees, in the rainy season often in caves, though they are capable of making primitive huts. They are hunters, and each Veddah, with his wife and family, keeps his hunting ground for the most part scrupulously to himself" (*Morals in Evolution* [1906], Part 1, pp. 43-47). Referring to the Yakuts of Siberia Sumner says (quoted by Thomas, *Social Origins*, p. 83), "The largest number of settlements contain four or five huts, with twenty or thirty souls." Similar examples might be added indefinitely.

like a social mind." Sanderson (*Publications of American Sociological Society*, XIV, 86-87), distinguishes between the community and the neighborhood as follows: "the community is the smallest geographical unit of organized association of the chief human activities; . . . the neighborhood is the smallest association group of families, with regard to place; it has no organization of activities."

The group forming habit of human beings is, of course, a biological inheritance from our prehuman ancestors. As Shaler says (*The Neighbor*, pp. 52-53), "the tribal habit of man is not an invention made by him. It evidently was inherited from his ancestors of the lower life, for among all the *Quadrumana* clearly to be reckoned his collateral but near organic and psychic kinsmen, this social habit prevails. The creatures usually dwell in groups which are evidently held together by a sympathetic bond, and are in more or less hostile relations to other groups of the same or diverse species, so that we may regard the tribal motive as even more affirmed than it could have been by human experience."

As long as primitive groups lived in a more or less migratory fashion the conception of common kinship, whether fictitious or real, seems to have been the dominant bond of union. But with the development of more stable modes of life within definite territorial locations the bond of kinship gradually becomes replaced by the bond of neighborhood. Maine says (*Early History of Institutions* [1875], p. 72), "I think, upon trustworthy evidence, that, from the moment when a tribal community settles down finally upon a definite space of land, the Land begins to be the basis of society in place of the Kinship."

The universality of the village community form of social organization has been well attested by Maine, Gomme, and others. Outside of the large cities the village community comprises the leading mode of social life for the peoples of all eastern countries. Moreover the present Russian *mir*, the Polish *zadruga*, and the Swiss *canton*, all present many of the characteristics of their eastern prototypes. Furthermore, to quote W. G. Sumner (*The Challenge of Facts and Other Essays*, p. 314), "the picture presented by the settlements in this country until the beginning of the eighteenth century was that of little groups of farmers scattered along the coast and rivers, forming towns under the loosest possible organization." These early villages, of course, formed the nuclei of our well-known New England town system.

Even with the development of city life the small neighborhood units tend to persist within the larger corporations. "The ancient city of Teheran . . . was divided into twelve districts, almost totally isolated from one another and permanently at variance with

one another" (R. M. Maciver, *Community*, p. 251). The same tendency is seen in Rome whose seven hills formed seven distinct neighborhoods. De Coulanges in *The Ancient City* shows that the Greek city was but a federation of local groups, each of which had its own religious and civil independence, and acted as a unit resenting interference on the part of the larger community. Of course similar tendencies toward local autonomy may be witnessed constantly in our own cities at the present time. Our cities grow by the inclusion of "satellite communities" and frequently such communities refuse to become absorbed in the larger corporations, and usually after surrendering their political autonomy retain for years a strong local consciousness and social independence.

In its traditional application the term neighborhood stood for rather definite group sentiments, which were the products of the intimate personal relations among the members of the small isolated communities of which society was formerly composed. The primary face-to-face associations of the traditional neighborhood group formed a universal nursery for what Cooley calls "the primary ideals," such as loyalty, truth, service, and kindness.¹

Small homogeneous societies, such as the Russian *mir*, the Polish *zadruga*, or the isolated rural village, furnish our best examples of primary groups, that is of groups with a single set of definitions of life to which all the members adhere with an emotional unanimity. The ideas pertaining to group welfare have dominance over individual wishes, consequently there is a minimum amount of individuality when compared with life in a modern city. The solidarity of the traditional neighborhood is of the spontaneous unreflective type.² It is the result of common human nature responding to common stimuli. The relation between individuals of the group is that of equality. Referring to the early village life in this country, Sumner says (*op. cit.*, p. 296), "It is plain that *equality* is the prevailing characteristic of this society; its members are equal in fortune, in education, in descent (at least after a generation or two), in mode of life, in social standing, in range of ideas, in political importance, and in everything else which is social, and

¹ *Social Organization*, chap. iv.

² See James Mark Baldwin, *The Individual and Society*, chap. ii, 1911.

nobody made them so." Wood, in recounting the personal traits of our modern professional neighbor, the city boss, expresses a similar idea (*Amer. Jour. of Sociol.*, XIX, 580), "The local boss, however autocratic he may be in the larger sphere of the city with the power which he gets from the neighborhood, must always be in and of the local people: and he is always very careful not to try to deceive the local people so far as their distinctively local interests are concerned. It is hard to fool a neighborhood about its own neighborhood affairs." It is this insistence upon social equality among neighbors that deters the development of latent leadership in our rural communities.¹

The solidarity of the traditional neighborhood included physical as well as social objects. The old swimming pool, the familiar hills and trees, the architecture and location of buildings, all function as sentimental attachments of the neighborhood. The individual becomes so closely identified with all these objects of early and intimate contact that they tend to form a part of the "extended self." Dr. W. I. Thomas,² in discussing the efforts of Germany to Prussianize Poland, says, "If the primary group is distinguished by face-to-face and sentimental relations I think it is correct to say that the land of the peasant was included in his group. And this land sentiment is the most important factor in the failure up to date of the plans of the colonization commission." Attachment for locality is even today a significant force in the segregation of a city's population.

Loyalty, self-sacrifice, and service are the natural products of the intimate personal neighborhood groups. As Tufts says, kindness suggests kinness, and applied originally to members of the "we-group" only.³ Kropotkin, in his *Mutual Aid* furnishes us with a vast array of evidence concerning the reciprocal kindness of members of primitive communities. Sumner describes (quoted by Thomas, *Social Origins*, p. 79) the neighborly relations of the Yakuts of northern Siberia: "If one man's cow calves earlier than those of the others, custom requires that he shall share cream and

¹ See an article by G. Walter Fiske, *Publications of Amer. Sociol. Society*, XI, 59.

² *Amer. Jour. of Sociol.*, XIX, 632.

³ Cf. Tufts, *Our Democracy, Its Origins and Its Tasks*, chap. iii.

milk with those neighbors who at that time have none." Cooley says (*Social Organization*, p. 38), "One is never more human, and, as a rule, never happier, than when he is sacrificing his narrow and merely private interest to the higher call of the congenial group." In his book *The American Town* (1906), p. 32, J. M. Williams describes the typical relationship between neighbors as follows: "A man must stand ready to help his neighbor as well as himself. Thus, when two woodsmen were working independently in adjoining wood-lots, each would impulsively run to the help of the other as he struggled to 'skid' a log upon a bob-sled. 'I'll help you and *you help me in return*' represents the complete relation. . . . To be so 'close-fisted' as to fail of generosity in time of a neighbor's need was bad enough, but to fail to return, when needed, help generously extended, was meanness too abject for expression."

Of course social friction and petty jealousies are as much the products of neighborhood association as are self-sacrifice and mutual aid. As E. C. Hayes¹ says, "While instinctive cohesion is stronger in small groups, so also is personal friction greater, and the members of a small group much in spatial proximity must have more in common in order to render their union permanent and strong, than is required to bind together larger populations."

In order to get an expression of the common-sense conception of the neighborhood within the city, I had the students in my classes at Ohio State University, who were residents of Columbus, write answers to the following questions: "Draw a map of that part of your city which you consider to be your neighborhood. Indicate on the map the location of your home, and state the number of years you have lived there. Give your reasons for bounding your neighborhood as you do." The following statements are typical of the fifty-seven replies analyzed:

(1) These are the streets I traverse oftenest. (2) On these streets live the people with whom I am acquainted and associate. (3) When we get in this part of town we feel that we are getting near home. (4) I consider this my neighborhood because it includes the houses nearest my home and because I know most of the families in this vicinity very intimately. (5) These are the streets that I used to play in and I still know most of the families residing here.

¹ *Introduction to Sociology*, p. 76.

(6) To my mind the word neighborhood includes the people right around my house; it is the vicinity very near. (7) We speak of anything happening within a square of our home as being in our neighborhood but we do not know half of the people who live there. We have lived on this street six years. (8) I used to play with the children from most of these families [that is, families within an area of about a block and a half on the same street]; my small brother made me acquainted with others. I have lived here nine years. (9) Neighborhood to me means the people living in the same block we live in, those across the alley in the rear, and those living in the block across the street. (10) I consider the cross streets as the boundary of our neighborhood, the streets being so wide, especially where I live, that we do not recognize the people on the other side. I have lived here fourteen years. (11) I consider that this constitutes our neighborhood [an area of a couple of blocks] because these are the families that we come in contact with most frequently on the street car and at community gatherings. (12) I consider these particular streets my neighborhood because generally they are the only surrounding scene and the only people with whom we come in daily contact. (13) I have no particular reason for using this boundary as the boundary of our neighborhood except that it is the block in which we live, the families here are not of the sociable type; I have lived here four years. (14) I should say that my immediate neighborhood consists of the two southeast and southwest blocks; while the block at the northwest is also my neighborhood it is not my immediate neighborhood because we do not associate with these people and the spirit of the two factions is different. I have lived in this section for six years. (15) I consider my immediate neighborhood around the square S. to M. avenues since that is where I have lived the last five years. I think this is my neighborhood because we meet these people oftener and feel that we know them better.

From a consideration of these statements and from an examination of the maps which accompanied them, it is clear to me that the conception which the average city dweller holds of his own neighborhood is that of a very small area within the immediate vicinity of his home, the limits of which seem to be determined by the extent of his personal observations and daily contacts.

But in referring to neighborhoods in general in Columbus much larger areas seem to be implied, spatial proximity to some central focus of attention being the determining feature. For example it is local custom to speak of "Indianola," "Glen Echo," "The Hilltop," "West Side," etc., as various neighborhoods within the city, although each of these areas embraces many streets and contains thousands of people. What then is the city neighborhood? For certain administrative purposes it is important to consider these

larger geographical expressions as units of neighborhood interest, while for other purposes, where intensity of social opinion counts, the smaller nuclei of common life may prove more effective units.

The segregation of the population within a city along racial, economic, social, and vocational lines, tends to give to different local areas at least an external coloring which enables one to draw more or less definite lines of demarcation between them. In the course of time these different areas acquire a sort of homogeneity and a historical continuity which develops a rudimentary sense of self-consciousness. This self-consciousness is usually enhanced if the area acquires a name designating its chief feature of attention, such as Niggertown, Flytown, Little Italy, etc. Such areas are, as a rule, in constant process of change, but since their selective influences attract about the same class of people from year to year their external aspects maintain a somewhat regular form. While districts of this sort vary greatly in size and in social solidarity, and while they may possess but few of the characteristics of the traditional neighborhood, nevertheless they possess sufficient significance from the standpoint of social selection, and have sufficient importance in community organization to warrant some such characterization as the term neighborhood.

If we consider the neighborhood then in this more general sense as representing a patch of common life within the larger community, which is sufficiently differentiated from the city as a whole to be thought of as a unit, we have several different types of neighborhoods represented in Columbus. Taking as our criterion for the classification of these neighborhoods, the chief element in population selection, we have three grades of economic neighborhoods,¹ that

¹ Consult Map II, p. 153, "Economic Areas in Columbus," for the locations of these different economic neighborhoods. It will be observed that, with but one exception, the south side, the economic status of the wards increases as one goes from the center out toward the periphery of the city. In fact the most exclusive neighborhoods all lie beyond the corporation limits. On the east side the suburban village of Bexley is the restricted area for the city's social élite. For many years Columbus has vainly sought to have this village enter the corporation, but up to date the villagers have preferred their local autonomy to the anonymity of city life. On the uplands, just beyond the western extremity of the city, are three other exclusive residential villages, Grand View Heights, Marble Cliff, and Upper Arlington. These villages are all of comparatively recent origin and the real estate restrictions limit the population to the wealthy home-owning class. Local consciousness is quite pronounced in all three and several experiments in community enterprises have been introduced, such as the local paper, the community church, the community kitchen, etc.

Another new residential section of the more exclusive type is fast developing just beyond the northern limits of the city. Many new additions have been opened up in this vicinity during the past few years and the Highlands east of the Olentangy River are rapidly becoming adorned with beautiful homes and picturesque gardens.

is, areas representing three fairly distinct economic divisions. These may be grouped as poor, middle class, and wealthy residential districts.

On the other hand, we have distinct racial and national groups where the chief elements in population selection are consciousness of kind, common language, and traditions. These are represented in Columbus by the large negro neighborhood on East Long Street, by the mixed Hebrew and colored neighborhood immediately east of the central part of the city, and by the homogeneous German neighborhood on South High Street.

In the third place we have the industrial neighborhood, in which reside the employees of a large industry, as, for example, the "South Side Neighborhood" surrounding the Columbus Steel Works, the chief factor in social selection being convenience to place of employment. Such neighborhoods usually represent a mixture of racial and national groups.

Again we may classify neighborhoods according to the status of their historical development into nascent, self-conscious, and disintegrating neighborhoods.¹ Like all other social groups, city neighborhoods are ever in a process of change. Fluctuations in rental and land values, due to the vacillation of city life, produce continuous movements of population from one section of the city to another, thus changing the economic and racial complexion of neighborhoods within a comparatively short space of time.²

The city neighborhood differs considerably from its traditional prototype in that it represents a much more selected social group. Economic, racial, and cultural forces, by distributing the population into different residential sections, give to the city neighborhood an external appearance of homogeneity that is not frequently found in small villages or rural neighborhoods—a homogeneity, however, as we shall see later, which is more apparent than real. Racial prejudice, national clannishness, and class conflict, all function as

¹ See Robert E. Park, *op. cit.*, p. 581.

² This is especially true with respect to immigrant neighborhoods. The economic progress of the immigrant is faster, as a rule, than that of the slum-dwelling American; consequently more immigrants than Americans graduate from the poorer neighborhoods. The district surrounding the Godman Guild Settlement House of Columbus has, according to the Settlement head, changed its immigrant population several times during the past decade.

social forces to give the city neighborhood what self-consciousness or solidarity it may possess.

IV. EXPERIMENTS IN NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION

The city of Columbus offers a number of rather unusual examples of the spontaneous development of local sentiment. In addition to the local improvement associations which have been organized in each of the larger local divisions of the city for the purpose of directing the general business interests, several streets have formed organizations to promote the interests of the residents on a single street or city block. Some of these organizations have interesting histories, and as experiments in the development of local sentiment are worthy of consideration. As far as can be ascertained these local organizations are all confined to the northern and western sections of the city, regions which are comparatively new, and for the most part occupied by home-owners.

*Oakland Avenue Flower and Garden Club.*¹—Oakland Avenue is located near the center of the sixteenth ward, a few blocks north of the university campus. The part of the street that is organized extends from High Street on the west to Indianola Avenue on the east—a distance of about a quarter of a mile. The street is now thirteen years old, having been held in reserve by a real estate firm while the surrounding area was built up. A number of property restrictions have given a physical uniformity to the street and at the same time made for a selection of population. There is a building restriction ranging from \$2,500 to \$3,000 (pre-war prices) as a minimum cost per residence. The lots are wide and the homes are required to be built thirty feet back from the curb line, thus leaving a uniformly wide space for lawns and shrubs. Double dwellings and apartment houses are forbidden, also places of business.

The street became formally organized in the spring of 1912, the year of the Columbus Centennial. During that spring the Columbus Flower and Garden Club was formed in order to promote general interest in city beautification. A prize was offered for the

¹ See Map I, p. 148, for the locations of each of the neighborhoods described in this chapter.

best-kept street in the city. Under the capable direction of one of the leading residents of the street, the "Oakland Flower and Garden Club" was organized. Meetings of the residents were held in the Northwood School, located at the foot of the street, with the result that an enthusiastic program for street beautification was adopted. Large granite bowlders were erected at both ends of the street, giving it an individuality and prominence apart from the general neighborhood. Uniformity in design of lawn decoration was adopted with the result that, at the end of the year, the citizens of the street celebrated the jubilee of being the proud winners of the civic prize for the most beautiful street in the city. Meanwhile a local paper, the *Oakland Avenue News*, was periodically published and distributed to all the families on the street.

The enthusiasm engendered by this successful start has never quite died out although it has diminished in intensity and has required careful fanning on the part of a few indomitable spirits whose interest in the success of the undertaking has remained unabated. Although a comparatively stable street, the extent of change of residence has been one of the chief causes of the fluctuating interest in the organization. Of the eighty-five families whose names were listed in the street directory published in the *Oakland Avenue News* for September, 1913, thirty-eight had moved from the street before June, 1918—a period of five years.

The organization, designed primarily to promote street beautification, subsequently gave rise to many local activities of a social and neighborly nature, among which may be mentioned the admirable practice of sending floral tributes to neighbors in case of sickness or death; social picnics in which all families on the street participate, ladies' clubs, and a renowned bowling team, composed of male residents of the street.

Northwood Avenue Flower and Garden Club.—Northwood Avenue, which lies next to, and runs parallel with, the street just described, supports a similar organization. In fact I might have described the two streets together, were it not for the strong neighborly rivalry and unitary group character of each. Northwood has a physical basis for group life precisely similar to that of Oakland Avenue. It formed a part of the same real estate division and,

therefore, was subjected to the same street restrictions. Its street organization was motivated by the same cause as that of Oakland Avenue but did not start off under quite such propitious circumstances. It took the Northwood residents a bit longer to get into teamlike action, but once started their organization has retained its health and vitality even better than that of its rival.

In the spring of 1917, with the assistance of some of my students, I made a brief study of the Northwood organization in order to get some clues respecting the nature of its group life. Every home on the street was visited with a brief questionnaire. I shall succinctly summarize here the results of our findings at that time. Questionnaires were filled out by fifty-one families. Of these eleven had been living on the street less than one year, thirty-two less than five years, and the remainder from five to ten years. All but three of the male heads of households were native-born Americans, and thirty-seven of the fifty-one male heads were born in the state of Ohio, six of whom were born in Columbus.

In reply to the question, "Why did you select this street as a place of residence?" fourteen said that it was on account of the attractive features of the street; another fourteen said it was because the house suited them; twenty could give no particular reason for their decision; while three maintained that their selection was due to the presence of friends and relatives on the street. Moreover, thirty-two families stated that they knew nothing of the street organization, prior to taking up residence there, while the remaining nineteen families were familiar with the social activities of the street and were more or less attracted to it on that account.

With respect to intimacy and personal acquaintance, nine families stated that they did not have even a speaking acquaintance with any other family on the street; thirty-five families reported that they had a speaking acquaintance with more than ten families on the street; while seven reported that they had a speaking acquaintance with more than thirty families. Six families stated that they were related, either by blood or marriage, to one or more other families on the street.

Of the male heads of households twelve reported no affiliation with community clubs or fraternal orders of any sort; twenty-three

were members of but one fraternal organization; while sixteen belonged to two or more clubs. As regards religious affiliations, eleven different sects were represented, including membership or attendance at twenty-four different churches. Moreover, the leading bread winners were distributed among twenty-eight different forms of occupation, and of these only nine reported drawing any clientage from the immediate neighborhood.

An effort was made to sound the attitudes of the different householders toward their street organization and its leading functions. Of the fifty-one families, twenty stated that they had never attended any of the street's meetings; thirty-nine considered the organization definitely worth supporting; of these, twenty considered its main value to be the promotion of friendship and neighborly feeling, while the remaining nineteen valued it chiefly from the standpoint of its effect upon property values. Twelve families did not consider the organization worthy of support. Concerning the street practice of sending flowers to neighbors in the event of sickness or death, twenty-nine families reported having received such floral tributes, and all but four indicated positive appreciation of the custom and thought it should be continued.

Turning now to a consideration of the street paper, the *Northwood Avenue Bulletin*, this little paper has been published at irregular intervals ever since 1912. It is an unusually attractive little sheet containing many interesting views of the street and supplying information with respect to gardening and other matters of family interest. It also carries a page headed "Neighborhood Happenings," under which are listed news items pertaining to the people of the street. This paper represents the idea of one or two enthusiastic promoters and has been published at a loss to the few people most intimately concerned. An effort was made to ascertain the attitudes of the householders toward this paper, with the interesting result that forty-two of the fifty-one families were strong in their approval of it and considered that its publication should be continued.

Although a few of the families residing on this street at the time the above survey was made were opposed to any attempts to start "this small town stuff" in the city, still all but five maintained that

it would cause them considerable regret to have to leave the street. Many families who stated that they had not the time to participate actively in the work of the street organization nevertheless indorsed the movement as being distinctly meritorious.

Ninth Avenue neighborhood.—Another interesting example of local manifestation of neighborhood sentiment and one which has been brought to the attention of the citizens of Columbus for the past decade or so is that of the residents of West Ninth Avenue. This little street, only two short blocks in length, is located close to the southwest corner of the university campus, in Ward 15. The Neil Avenue street-car line forms the eastern boundary of the neighborhood and the university farm borders it on the west.

Unlike the streets just described, the Ninth Avenue neighborhood supports no formal organization or street paper, but for years past the residents of the street have shown evidence of a distinct group feeling which reaches its highest culmination every year in a Fourth of July celebration. At this time the street is roped off from city traffic and all the residents of the block participate in a general street picnic, followed in the evening by a display of fireworks, which has become a tradition in the local life of the community. The street is much shorter than either of the others described, making it unnecessary to develop secondary means of communication, such as the local newspaper.

In physical appearance the street differs considerably from the surrounding area. In the first place it is built up with a distinctly superior type of residence from that found in the neighboring locality, the assessed value of the homes ranging from \$4,000 to \$15,000. The lawns are spacious and uniformly deep, lending a unitary character to the street.

In our brief study of this street we found that its group life depended very largely upon the energetic activities of a single family. The head of this household and his wife make a hobby of fostering neighborhood sentiment among the residents of the street. The meetings that are held to plan entertainments, etc., are usually conducted at this man's residence.

In addition to the club life that prevails among the residents of this street, such as picnics for the children, social activities of the

women, and quoit games among the men, various other forms of collective action for local purposes have taken place. For instance, the street has persistently acted as a unit to keep its western vista over the university farm free from obstruction. It has also had several experiments in corporate action in fighting the intrusion of objectionable structures within its limits.

Glenmawr Avenue Improvement Association.—This little neighborhood is located in an attractive spot near the northern end of the sixteenth ward. The nature of this community and the purpose of its organization are well described in the following words of its secretary:

There is a park thirty-five feet wide and about one thousand feet long in the center of Glenmawr Avenue, and when the street was improved this space was left by the city with no improvements whatever, not even grass. It was necessary for the property owners to improve the condition of this park, and, therefore, the organization was formed with a view to beautifying the park and establishing a standard in the carrying forward of any improvements on the street, such as placing shade trees, constructing sidewalks, placing steps from the street to the yard, etc. Present membership, sixty-eight families. Any property owner on Glenmawr Avenue or any families renting property located on that street are eligible to become members.

The organization was able to have an ordinance passed through council permitting the placing of the sidewalks within two feet of the curb rather than five feet as is ordinarily required, which avoided the cutting off of the lawns, thus reducing the front yard space.

The park which was simply a bare space of ground, has been made level, fertilized, and a good standard of grass obtained. Seventy shade trees have been placed along the edge of the park and between these shrubbery has been placed. At the ends of the park flower beds with perennial flowers are maintained and gravel walks placed at intervals across the park to avoid persons having to cross from one side of the street to the other walking on the grass.

An ordinance was passed last fall by the Council of the City of Columbus, at the suggestion of the Association, requiring the installation of five cobblestone pillars, on which cluster lights will be installed through the center of the park. The grass in the park is taken care of by the residents without expense.

This Association also endeavors to have at their business meetings social entertainments for the residents of the street only, and by so doing have created a friendly feeling among the residents that could not otherwise have existed.

The money necessary to carry on the improvements that have been made in the park is obtained by assessment of the various residents of the street, the

amount being collected without any hardship, and there is always money in the treasury to carry on improvements that might be authorized.¹

The foregoing organization was formed in the spring of 1914, its meetings are held monthly at the home of one of the residents of the street. It serves an area of about two city blocks.

The Hilltop neighborhood.—The Hilltop is more than a neighborhood; it is a city within a city. It is a community of about 15,000 people, topographically separated from the city proper. It is an area complete in itself, having its own schools, churches, stores, shops, parks, fire-hall, social clubs, local newspaper, and improvement association, which is really equivalent to a chamber of commerce.

The Hilltop, as indicated on Map I, page 148, lies in the extreme western end of the city, about four miles west of the state's Capitol. As the name implies the Hilltop is a promontory rising considerably above the "flats" which separate it from the heart of the city. The division now comprises an area of several square miles and includes within its confines the State Hospital for the Insane.

Comparatively speaking the Hilltop is a new section of Columbus. Its chief development as a residential area has taken place during the past fifteen years, but once available for settlement its attractive topographical features made it an eldorado for the better class of home-seekers, with the result that it is now a city of new homes clustered around the few historic residences which graced the landscape in days gone by. Moreover, it is a region of considerable historic importance. Camp Chase of Civil War renown was located here, also the Confederate Cemetery, which lies in the southwestern part of the district.

Barring a small Italian neighborhood, located on McKinley Avenue at the rear of the Hospital for the Insane, and a larger colored colony located in the south along Sullivant Avenue, the Hilltop is primarily inhabited by white American stock, the majority of whom are home-owners of the more prosperous class. An astonishingly large number of the leading public men of the city have their homes in this region, which fact doubtlessly accounts, in good measure at least, for the public spirit displayed among the residents of the Hilltop.

¹ Letter received from the secretary, January, 1920.

The negro neighborhood, just referred to, is the "fly in the ointment" with respect to the community pride of the people of the Hilltop. This colored section, covering an area of about six blocks, with a population of approximately 600 people, is not a recent development. A number of the colored families have resided in this spot for over thirty years, but a fresh influx of colored settlers arrived immediately after the Springfield riots a decade or so ago. A real estate dealer, devoid of "social vision," and "greedy for gain" sold his property to these people with the result that they are now fixtures in the community. Aside, however, from the acute social problems arising out of their presence in the schools, the colored people live to themselves and do not come in contact with the general social life of the community. The colored neighborhood has its own churches, stores, and motion-picture house, and the Camp Chase street-car line is used almost exclusively for transportation to and from the city. This colored neighborhood is one of the most orderly and progressive negro localities in the city. According to the estimate of one of the oldest colored residents, 75 per cent of the families own their homes; and it is a matter of local pride that "no one has been sent to the penitentiary from this district during the past twenty-five years."

The local consciousness of the residents of the Hilltop has manifested itself in many ways. In the first place a local paper called the *Hilltop News* is published weekly and read by more than "eight thousand Hilltoppers every week." This sheet is the "official organ of the Hilltop business men" and carries advertising and news items of local interest. It also serves as the official spokesman for the Hilltop Improvement Association, an organization of Hilltop residents designed to promote the welfare of the "Hilltop, its people, and their homes."

The Hilltop Improvement Association was organized in 1911 for the purpose just stated. It was promoted by a number of the most enterprising citizens of the community including one of the city's most prominent councilmen. No local organization of the city has been more active in the promotion of local interests, or has achieved more for the territory served than the Hilltop Improvement Association. Its field of activities has included negotiations with the city council for the procuring of local satisfactions, such as a

recreation building, street-car accommodation, city deliveries, etc. It has also stimulated local pride in the care of property and in the repulsion of undesirable commercial encroachments, and at the same time has done much to engender a feeling of neighborliness and sociability among the people.

The community consciousness among the people of the Hilltop is due largely to the peculiar topographical features of the district which give it a unitary character quite distinct from the rest of the city. Moreover its conflict with the city proper in regard to flood protection measures relative to the flood area which separates it from the down-town district, has resulted in the development of the "we feeling" as contrasted with the rest of the city. In addition to this, the boosting attitude has been maintained by the comparatively large number of enterprising public citizens who have their homes in this district. These home-owners appreciate the significance of local community pride and consciously attempt to stimulate it in their locality.

Conclusions.—From a study of these and other experiments in neighborhood organization, I venture the following conclusions concerning neighborhood work in general. First, that neighborhood sentiment is most easily engendered where the physical basis of life affords a unitary character sufficient to differentiate the neighborhood from the larger community. Second, neighborhood sentiment thrives best where there is a homogeneity and stability of population accompanied by a high percentage of home ownership.¹ Third, other things being equal, the difficulty of maintaining local interest in local projects varies directly with the extent of territory covered and the number of families included. There is considerable evidence to show that a street more than two blocks in length tends to divide itself into subgroups, especially when two different street-car lines are used by the residents in communication

¹ According to our general test of stability for Columbus, i.e., the percentage of the 1917 electors who re-registered in their respective precincts in 1918, the organized neighborhoods just described rank comparatively high in stability. The average re-registration for the entire city was 58.6 per cent and for the most stable precinct 77.8 per cent. The precinct in which Oakland and Northwood avenues are located had a re-registration of 75.5 per cent, the Ninth Avenue precinct a re-registration of 69.1 per cent, and the Glenmawr precinct 64.9 per cent.

with the down-town district. Fourth, it may be stipulated that interest in the most obviously beneficial local enterprises, even under the most favorable conditions, is not as spontaneous and natural as many of our promoters of neighborhood enterprises seem to assume. In each experiment in neighborhood organization cited above, the interest in local affairs has been more or less artificially sustained by the "hard work" of a few energetic promoters.

Nevertheless, the value of such street organization cannot be doubted. No one who has visited any of the streets which have been described would question the superior merits of corporate action over the haphazard ways of traditional individualism. Aside from the social benefits accruing from local collective action, the effect on real estate values is in itself an important consideration, and one which real estate companies are beginning to appreciate.¹

¹ I have been informed by several residents of the streets in question that they have been offered valuable concessions by real estate companies to promote similar organizations in new residential divisions which are now being put on the market.

[*To be continued*]